

1960

The survey showed the range of FBI services to other law enforcement agencies in training, locating wanted men, providing scientific aids to crime detection, identifying disaster victims reporting crime and mobilizing law enforcement efforts against certain types of crime.

HIGHLIGHTS NOTED

These were highlights of the survey: The FBI laboratory's work, available free to all American law enforcement agencies, rose about 80 percent in the past decade to an alltime peak of 184,993 scientific examinations in the 1959 fiscal year.

Among many reference files available to local officers is the national fraudulent check file. This file, rated as the national clearinghouse for fraudulent checks, at year's end contained nearly 90,000 specimens of bad checks.

The FBI's Identification Division, central repository for fingerprint identifying data, closed the decade of the 1950's with 154,363,719 fingerprint cards on file. When a local law enforcement agency requests it, the FBI will place a stop notice in its fingerprint files on a wanted man. By this method, 16,967 fugitives were identified for local law enforcement agencies in 1959.

AIR CRASH WORK

The FBI's disaster squad of fingerprint experts, during 1959, was called on to identify victims after airplane crashes in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Texas, Virginia, and the Gulf of Mexico. In two cases, the crash near Charlottesville, Va., on October 30, and the Gulf of Mexico crash on November 16, the squad successfully identified 100 percent of the available victims.

An alltime high of 1,149 fugitives were located by FBI agents during fiscal 1959 under the Fugitive Felon Act, which authorizes the FBI to go after criminals who have fled across State lines to avoid prosecution for the most serious crimes.

During the 1950's, the FBI assisted in 27,418 police training schools in the United States. During the decade, regional law enforcement conferences sponsored by the FBI throughout the country spotlighted attacks on such crime problems as auto thefts, thefts of transit goods, interstate trafficking in stolen property, bombing and bomb threats, bank robbery, fleeing felons, organized crime and racketeering.

Federal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I have presented the following statement to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of legislation which would provide a pay raise for postal workers and other Federal employees:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT E. COOK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE IN BEHALF OF POSTAL PAY INCREASE LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the enactment of legislation in the present session of Congress to provide a pay raise for our postal and other Federal employees. Such a raise is long overdue. It would raise the wages of these employees to the level of wages in private industry.

The correspondence from my district reveals instance after instance of financial hardship for these local representatives of

our Federal Government. The average letter carrier's salary of \$4,640 is hardly enough to meet the present-day high costs of food, clothing, shelter, and medical expenses.

If we expect these trained workers to remain in Federal service, this Congress must face up to their financial problems and vote them a needed pay increase.

I have introduced H.R. 11231 calling for these needed increases. It is similar to the so-called Morrison bill, and I hope its principles will receive the favorable consideration of your committee.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice in opposition to the proposed civil rights bill—the so-called Celler-McCulloch bill—because I believe it is loaded with danger to the very fundamentals upon which our Government is based. My fears are not simply a reflection of the so-called southern viewpoint, nor do I see the threats to be just against southern institutions. Rather, I see in this bill a weakening of some of the very foundations of our Constitution—foundations that we all have been sworn to protect.

I cannot in a few moments go into the full details of the objectionable features of the bill, though I will touch briefly on one of its provisions that particularly concerns me. First, however, I would like to say to those who are pushing it through that, even if what they were trying to accomplish were for the general good, this is the wrong way to go about it. For, in my judgment, the bill is out of joint with its purpose. It will not amplify the civil rights that now prevail nor will it insure their enforcement. It will on the contrary retard and obstruct and embitter. The bill is out of true relation to the climate of opinion that prevails in the United States, making it seem as if we were in the midst of some kind of internecine war between our Negro and our white populations. It will be no more successful in accomplishing the intended purpose than the prohibition amendment was during the 1920's. As did that attempt to legislate social customs, it may make the problem worse than it is at this time.

For the problem is being solved—slowly, it is true, but no major social change can take place too rapidly without revolution, and I am sure no one wants that. Anyone who reflects can see the tremendous strides made by our Negro population during the past few decades—and that progress is continuing at an accelerated pace. One needs only to observe the increasing number of well-dressed and well-housed members of the Negro race in any city, in-

cluding those in the South. One only needs to note the rising literacy rates, the increase in the number of professional people, and the increasing influence of colored voters.

There are Negroes—and I am glad of it—who are Members of this very House. There is a Negro who is the president of the Borough of Manhattan. One of the foremost members of the United Nations staff is an American Negro. They hold, as they should, positions of esteem in the South as their talents permit. Of course in certain quarters there are some hardships, even humiliations. But then I suppose I would not be welcome in a meeting of Democrats even if I sought an invitation, and I can imagine meetings of that political persuasion where I would be grabbed by the seat of the pants and the scruff of the neck and booted out of the place. In some parts of our country this religious grouping is not kindly disposed to that religious grouping.

There may even be errors of decency and taste and fairness that we all deplore. But can it be possible that at this late date—anno Domini 1960—the problem, instead of diminishing, as I certainly believe it has, has grown to such gargantuan proportions as to call for this overwhelming hullabaloo of legislative agitation and excitement?

Instead of fostering steady development, this bill would shake the very foundations of our Constitution in an attempt to hurry the process. It would usurp important rights of the States in the control of elections, and not merely the rights of the Southern States. Of equally grave concern, this bill would constitute an important breakthrough in the field of Federal control of education.

Hidden behind the smokescreen of civil rights, the original bill would grant the Federal Government authority to seize local educational institutions and administer them. Although restricted by amendment, some of this authority remains. Most interesting is the basis for determining which schools can be taken. Only those can be taken which have been built with partial Federal contribution under the federally impacted aid legislation. Yet, proponents of Federal aid, in every debate or speech on the subject, always point to a clause included in the bills insuring that the Federal Government will in no way interfere with local educational systems.

I say let us stop this thing, recognizing as we must that the ill-conceived law enforcement techniques in this bill reach out into the future. They inflict injustice instead of preventing it and they bring with them pain and offense that after two World Wars and Korea we had done so much to blur and appease. We in the south along with our friends in the north will find paths for the adjudication and the amelioration of wrongs that do exist and permit time and maturity to wipe them out. The process may be slow but it is sure and it is enduring. This crude enforcement method is a way of turning back the clock of history and returning to the use of force and vengeance where reason and tolerance had been proved so successful.

March 30

A2854

Physicians and Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, several months ago my esteemed friend and colleague, JOHN P. SAYLOR, of the 22d District of Pennsylvania, arranged for me to attend a meeting in Johnstown, Pa. The meeting was sponsored by the Cambria County Medical Society and as the principal speaker that evening I discussed with the distinguished membership of that organization the issues involved in the question of federally sponsored health care. It was also my privilege to inform that group of the outstanding contributions their able and respected Congressman, JOHN P. SAYLOR, was making to the considerations of responsible government and free enterprise.

I found the doctors of this medical society extremely interested in national affairs. I also found them with renewed awareness of the urgent need to be solidly back of their Congressman.

During the course of that meeting I met many of the doctors present on a personal basis including the society's then president, Dr. Joseph C. Hatch. Several months later there came to my attention a February 1960 copy of that society's monthly publication "The Medical Comment." I noticed the remarks of Dr. Hatch as he brought his term of office to a close in January 1960.

I believe Dr. Hatch's observations bear the consideration of every American citizen and for that reason I will include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Honored guests and distinguished colleagues, tonight is my valediction as the president of the Cambria County Medical Society. I leave an office that I have held with great pride and I hope with some usefulness.

In the past year our county society has had many accomplishments resulting not from my stewardship, but from the effective work done by individuals and by the society's committees under the guidance of dedicated committee chairmen. In this connection I would specifically mention—

Dr. D. George Bloom for his commendable work with the State board of licensure.

Dr. Paul McCloskey for his work on the State economic committee.

Dr. Victor Bantly and his economic committee for their work on the fee schedule.

Dr. Reginald Davis, Dr. John B. Lovette, and Dr. George Hudson whose activities in the house of delegates were extremely valuable.

The members of the Cambria County Academy of General Practice whose leaders for the year 1960 are President Dr. Yale S. Lewine, Vice President Dr. Raymond L. Dandrea, Secretary Dr. Charles F. Reeder, and Treasurer Dr. George Hay.

Our devoted and untiring board of directors which kept the ship of state at an even keel through the year and finally,

Our executive secretary, Mr. Robert Lynch, whose endless capacity for work has enhanced the reputation and efficiency of this society. Without his tireless efforts and

those of Dr. John Cwik we would still not have our Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan.

That I do not enumerate other outstanding work is not an indication of disregard or unawareness on my part of the significance of that work. It is instead in consideration of your time and in deference to events that are to follow on this evening's program. I would, however, express my heartfelt appreciation to my fellow officers of this past year who did so much to keep me from more frequent mistakes; I would also thank the society's membership for its support. Without that help and support, nothing would have been possible.

In my remarks this evening I propose to comment briefly on an important but often neglected aspect of a physician's daily life—citizenship. In terms of public service the activities of our profession are exceeded by no other; in terms of service to country in behalf of good government, our contribution falls considerably short. Except in time of war, our service to country is too often confined to paying our taxes and to infrequent trips to the voting booth. In the past three decades as a consequence of this neglect of citizenship we have found our taxes rising and our influence at the polls declining.

I have mentioned the trend of three decades, a period comprising less than a single generation. That is all the time required to bring our profession, and more importantly—our Nation to a position of critical juncture with respect to historical ideals and concepts of human liberty, economic opportunity, and individual incentive. It is in this 30-year period that freedom has been weakened by the inroads of bureaucratic governmental paternalism.

Why do I, a doctor of medicine, presume to talk to you about such things? As recently as 12 months ago I would not have done so. My interests at that time were entirely confined to the practice of my profession and keeping abreast of the rapid changes in medical scientific lore. A year ago an event occurred to distract me from my preoccupation. I assumed the office of president of your society.

This event imposed upon me responsibilities that directed my attention to new vistas of physician interest—vistas that in a scientific sense may have no direct relationship to medicine but which have a very marked potential impact on medical practice and health progress. This impelled exposure to socioeconomic affairs made me acutely aware of the price of our citizen neglect. It is to the end of impressing upon you the need for a renaissance in citizenship on the part of the American physician that I direct the balance of my remarks.

In our professional preoccupation with medical ills we have overlooked our Nation's No. 1 malady—"Federalitis." This is a disease that manifests an insatiable craving for revenues—that is exceeded in intensity only by an immoderate desire to spend. There is an involvement of bureaucratic hypnosis that produces the hallucination that the mere existence of a problem demands solution by the National Government. The disease causes a schizophrenic type of Americanism that flourishes on class prejudice and seeks to glorify mediocrity by rewarding the idle with the productivity of the industrious.

Federalitis has existed in the United States for 30 years and we have done little or nothing about it. We have thought too much of the rights of citizenship and too little of the duties of citizenship. As the 18th century statesman and political scientist Edmund Burke put it, "The only thing the forces of evil need for victory, is for enough good men to do nothing." Because we have been content in the last 30 years to do nothing, Federalitis has flourished.

I do not mean to suggest that the blame is exclusively attributable to the medical

profession. In our neglect of citizenship we have been joined ingloriously by other citizen groups. However we must recognize that physicians occupy a position of prestige and influence in their respective communities. This position gives unique opportunity to contribute to the formulation of sound public opinion on the important issues confronting our people.

Let us now turn to a brief examination of some of the consequences of citizen neglect in the past 30 years and then consider the problems presently confronting our profession to see how we can use our citizen status to help solve them.

The abandonment of citizen responsibility to Government bureaucracy in the past three decades has not been without its cost. In the last 30 years—

Our Federal Government has operated in the red in 24 years or 80 percent of the time;

Our Federal spending and tax collections have increased more than 25-fold;

Our Federal public debt has increased \$270 billion;

Our daily lives have been encroached upon and made less free by Government bureaucracy;

Our Nation's security has been made less secure by tragic ineptness in the conduct of our foreign affairs;

Our State and local governments have joined with the Federal Government in vain fiscal folly to spend us rich, smart, and secure.

This enumeration of bauble and blunder is not the cry of an alarmist. The facts are all too real; the dangers are all too present. Because of the limits of allowable time let me take only one of the things I enumerated for further analysis.

The national debt increased \$270 billion in the last 30 years. So what difference does it make? It makes this much difference. The United States has 20 percent more debt and 43 percent less income than all the other nations of the world. It means higher taxes and consequently fewer jobs because our free enterprise society is that much less able to compete on favorable terms with the economic endeavors of the nationals of other countries. Our existing national debt requires annual carrying charges of \$9 billion. This item constitutes the largest single non-defense-related expenditure in our Federal budget. That \$9 billion amount is more than the combined Federal, State, and local taxes paid by all the businesses and individuals in Pennsylvania. We have now reached the point where we cannot wait until it is convenient to pay our own way. It is urgent that we achieve budgetary surpluses so that a sustained program of debt reduction can be accomplished.

This onerous public indebtedness has been created despite the imposition of unprecedented tax burdens on our free enterprise society. In regard to taxes, we have reached the point where Federal, State, and local tax collections take one-third of our net national product. Thus we have gone one-third of the route toward the total socialization of the economic endeavors of our citizens.

Historians tell us that no great nation has ever been conquered from without until it has first destroyed itself from within. I submit to you there is no middle ground in dealing with the grave issue of our Nation's fiscal affairs. Sound fiscal principles are not divisible.

As was true in the case of fiscal matters, so it is true with regard to so-called social progress, that voter apathy has had its cost. The accomplishments of the past 30 years have been accompanied by a curtailment of economic opportunity and by the sacrifice of individual liberty to Government bureauc-